

Supplemental Appendix for: Political Trust and Support for Immigration in the European Mass Public

- **Supplemental Appendix A** - Contains: (1) descriptive statistics, and (2) details on how each variable was created and coded.
- **Supplemental Appendix B** - Contains: Tables B1-B7.

Detail on Variable Coding - 2014-2015 (7th Round) ESS

This includes, for each ESS variable used in the main paper, detail on question wording, the ESS variable name, and how each variable was re-coded. The data and codebook are publicly available at the following link (<https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/download.html?r=7>)

- **Allow Europeans to Immigrate.** “To what extent do you think [country] should allow people from poorer countries in Europe to come and live here?” Created from EIMPCNT. Re-coded so that 0 = allow none/allow a few; 1 = allow some/allow many. *This question was not asked of ESS respondents in the Czech Republic.*
- **Allow Non-Europeans to Immigrate.** “To what extent do you think [country] should allow people from poorer countries outside Europe to come and live here?” Created from IMPCNTR. Re-coded so that 0 = allow none/allow a few; 1 = allow some/allow many.
- **Allow Muslims to Immigrate.** “To what extent do you think [country] should allow Muslims from other countries to come and live here?” Created from ALMUSLV. Takes on values of 0 or 1. Re-coded so that 0 = allow none/allow a few and 1 = allow some/allow many.
- **Allow Roma to Immigrate.** “To what extent do you think [country] should allow Roma from other countries to come and live here?” Created from ALGYPLV. Re-coded so that 0 = allow none/allow a few; 1 = allow some/allow many.
- **Allow Jewish to Immigrate.** “To what extent do you think [country] should allow Jewish people from other countries to come and live here?” Created from ALJEWLV. Re-coded so that 0 = allow none/allow a few; 1 = allow some/allow many.
- **Refugee Applications.** “How much do you agree or disagree that the government should be generous in judging people’s applications for refugee status?” Created from GVRFGAP. Re-coded so that 0 = disagree strongly/disagree/neither agree nor disagree and 1 = agree/agree strongly.

- **Political trust.** Created by combining three questions into an additive index ($\alpha = 0.901$). This three-question index originally ranged from 0 to 30, we re-scaled it to range from 0 to 1. Higher values = greater political trust. The three questions used to form this index are: trust in country’s parliament (TRSTPRL), trust in politicians (TRSTPLT), and trust in political parties (TRSTPRT). The first question (TRSTPRL) asks “How much do you personally trust the country’s parliament?” It ranges from 0 to 10 (“no trust at all” to “complete”). The second question (TRSTPLT) asks “How much do you personally trust politicians?” It ranges from 0 to 10 (“no trust at all” to “complete trust”). The third question (TRSTPRT) asks “How much do you personally trust political parties?” This question ranges from 0 to 10 (“no trust at all” to “complete trust”).
- **Female.** “Interviewer code, gender of respondent.” Created from GNDR. Re-coded so that 0 = male; 1 = female.
- **Age.** “Age of respondent.” Created from AGEA. Ranges from 14-114. Measured in years.
- **Tertiary education.** “Highest level of education, ES-ISCED.” Created from EISCED. Re-coded so that 0 = less than tertiary education; 1 = tertiary education or higher.
- **Income.** “Household’s total net income, all sources.” Created from HINCTNTA. ? Measured in deciles; ranges from 0-10. Higher values = more household income.
- **Parents Foreign-Born.** Created from FACNTR (“was your father born in [this] country”) and MOCNTR (“was your mother born in [this] country”). Re-coded so that 0 = both parents were born in the country; 1 = one more more parents were born outside of the country.
- **Live in a Big City.** “Respondent’s description of the area where they live.” Created from DOMICIL. Re-coded so that 0 = farm or home in countryside/country village/town/small city/suburbs/outskirts of big city; 1 = a big city.
- **Economic satisfaction.** “On the whole how satisfied are you with the present state of the economy in [country]?” Created from STFECO. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“extremely dissatisfied” to “extremely satisfied”). Re-scaled to range from 0 and 1. Higher values = greater economic satisfaction.
- **Ideology.** “Where would you place yourself on this scale, where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?” Created from LRSCALE. Ranges from 0-10 (“left” to “right”). Re-scaled to range from 0 and 1. Higher values = greater conservatism.
- **Social trust.** Created by combining three questions into an additive index ($\alpha = 0.760$). This three-question index originally ranged from 0 to 30, we re-scaled it to range from 0 to 1. Higher values = greater social trust. The three questions used to form this index are: PPLTRUST, PPLFAIR, AND PPLHLP. The first question (PPLTRUST) asks “generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted, or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?” It ranges from 0 to 10 (“you can’t be

too careful” to “most people can be trusted”). The second question (PPLFAIR) asks “do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance, or would they try to be fair?” It ranges from 0 to 10 (“most people try to take advantage of me” to “most people try to be fair”). The third question (PPLHLP) asks “would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves?” It ranges from 0 to 10 (“people mostly look out for themselves” to “people mostly try to be helpful”).

- **Self-transcendence.** Created by combining five questions into an additive index ($\alpha = 0.725$). This index ranges from 5-30; we re-scale it to range from 0 to 1. Higher values = greater self-transcendence. The five values used to form this index are created using Human Values questions originally developed by Shalom Schwartz (see, e.g., Schwartz 1994 *Journal of Social Issues*). We use the following link (<https://i2s.anu.edu.au/resources/schwartz-theory-basic-values>), along with ESS guidelines at the following link ([https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=values#:~:text=Human%20Values%20\(Core%20%2D%20All%20rounds,to%20their%20basic%20value%20orientations.\)](https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=values#:~:text=Human%20Values%20(Core%20%2D%20All%20rounds,to%20their%20basic%20value%20orientations.))) to create these variables from the 2014 ESS data.

Self-transcendence is created from the following five variables (IPEQOPT, IPUDRST, IPHLPPL, IPLYLFR, and IMPENV). For each question, respondents are asked “please listen to each description and tell me how much each person is or is not like you.” The first question (IPEQOPT) asks “important that people are treated equally and have equal opportunities.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The second question (IPUDRST) asks “important to understand different people.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The third question (IPHLPPL) asks “important to help people and care for others well-being.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The fourth question (IPLYLFR) asks “important to be loyal to friends and devote to people close.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The fifth question (IMPENV) asks “important to care for nature and environment.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”).

- **Conservation.** Created by combining six questions into an additive index ($\alpha = 0.707$). This index ranges from 6-36; we re-scale it to range from 0 to 1. Higher values = greater conservation. The six values used to form this index are created using Human Values questions originally developed by Shalom Schwartz (see, e.g., Schwartz 1994 *Journal of Social Issues*). We use the following link (<https://i2s.anu.edu.au/resources/schwartz-theory-basic-values>), along with ESS guidelines at the following link ([https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=values#:~:text=Human%20Values%20\(Core%20%2D%20All%20rounds,to%20their%20basic%20value%20orientations.\)](https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=values#:~:text=Human%20Values%20(Core%20%2D%20All%20rounds,to%20their%20basic%20value%20orientations.))) to create these variables from the 2014 ESS data.

Conservation is created from the following six variables (IMPSAFE, IPFRULE, IPMODST, IPSTRGV, IPBHPRP, and IMPTRAD). For each question, respondents are asked “please listen to each description and tell me how much each person is or is not like you.” The first question (IMPSAFE) asks “important to live in secure and safe

surroundings.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The second question (IPFRULE) asks “important to do what is told and follow rules.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The third question (IPMODST) asks “important to be humble and modest, not draw attention.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The fourth question (IPSTRGV) asks “important that government is strong and ensures safety.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The fifth question (IPBHPRP) asks “important to behave properly.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”). The sixth question (IMPTRAD) asks “important to follow traditions and customs.” The responses are coded to range from 1-6 (“not like me at all” to “very much like me”).

- **National Government Satisfaction.** “Now thinking about the [country] government, how satisfied are you with the way it is doing its job?.” Created from STFGOV. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“extremely dissatisfied” to “extremely satisfied”). Re-scaled to range from 0 to 1. Higher values = greater government satisfaction.
- **Immig Impact on Crime.** “Are [country]’s crime problems made better or worse by people coming to live here from other countries?.” Created from IMWBCRM. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“crime problems made worse” to “crime problems made better”). Higher values = more favorable perceptions of immigrants/immigration.
- **Immig Impact on Jobs.** “Would you say that people who come to live here generally take jobs away from workers in [country], or generally help to create new jobs?.” Created from IMTCJOB. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“take jobs away” to “create new jobs”). Higher values = more favorable perceptions of immigrants/immigration.
- **Immig Impact on Services.** “Most people who come to live here work and pay taxes. They also use health and welfare services. On balance, do you think people who come here take out more than they put in or put in more than they take out?.” Created from IMBLECO. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“generally take out more” to “generally put in more”). Higher values = more favorable perceptions of immigrants/immigration.
- **Immig Impact on Economy.** “Would you say it is generally bad or good for [country]’s economy that people come to live here from other countries?.” Created from IMBGECO. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“bad for the economy” to “good for the economy”). Higher values = more favorable perceptions of immigrants/immigration.
- **Immig Impact on Culture.** “Would you say that [country]’s cultural life is generally undermined or enriched by people coming to live here from other countries?.” Created from IMUECLT. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“cultural life undermined” to “cultural life enriched”). Higher values = more favorable perceptions of immigrants/immigration.
- **Immig Impact on Place to Live.** “Is [country] made a worse or a better place to live by people coming to live here from other countries?.” Created from IMWBCNT. Ranges from 0 to 10 (“worse place to live” to “better place to live”). Higher values = more favorable perceptions of immigrants/immigration.

Detail on CHES Data

This includes detail on the 2014 Chapel Hill Expert Survey (CHES) data that we used in our paper. We specifically discuss the IMMIGRATE_POLICY variable that we used in Figure 3 (in the main paper) to examine heterogeneity in the trust-immigration relationship across countries. The CHES data and codebook are publicly available at the following link (<https://www.chesdata.eu/2014-chapel-hill-expert-survey>).

The CHES data also includes an Expert Dataset that asks various “political scientists specializing in political parties and European integration” to “provide information about the positioning of 268 political parties across 31 countries, including all EU member states, Norway, Switzerland, and Turkey.” The CHES data represents the “longest-running, most extensive expert survey on political parties in Europe.”

One of these policy areas is immigration. We use the mean expert rating (the variable IMMIGRATE_POLICY in the Expert-level dataset) for each governing party and match that up with our 20-country dataset (from the 2014-2015 ESS). Below in Table A2 we list the head governing party for each country in the 2014-2015 ESS and also list the mean immigration score and mean ideology score, based on these expert CHES ratings.

There were a few cases (5/20 countries) in our data (2014-2015 ESS) where the head governing party was not the same for 2014 *and* 2015 (Jan - Dec of both years). These countries were: Sweden, Switzerland, Slovenia, Finland, and Denmark. To maintain consistency, we chose to demarcate the governing party as the one that was in control in 2014 (when the large majority of ESS survey responses were collected).

Table A2: CHES Expert Ratings of Governing Parties’ Immigration Stances and Left-Right Ideology

Country	Head Governing Party	Mean Immigration Score (0-10)	Mean Ideology Score (0-10)
Sweden	Moderate	2.3	3.8
Switzerland	Social Democratic	3.3	2.1
Slovenia	Modern Centre	3.5	5.3
Poland	Civic Platform	4.0	5.7
Czech Republic	CSSD	4.3	3.1
Austria	SPO	4.4	3.9
Lithuania	Social Democratic	4.5	3.2
France	Socialist	4.7	3.8
Finland	National Coalition	5.1	7.7
Estonia	Reform	5.2	7.3
Denmark	Social Democrats	5.5	4.4
Germany	CDU	5.7	5.9
Belgium	MR	6.2	7.0
Ireland	Fine Gael	6.2	6.3
Norway	Conservative	6.3	7.3
Portugal	PSD	6.8	6.7
Netherlands	VVD	7.5	7.9
Hungary	Fidesz	7.8	7.9
United Kingdom	Conservative	8.0	7.0
Spain	Peoples’ Party	8.1	7.3

